DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 296 HE 021 163

TITLE	A Manual for the Evaluation Visit.
INSTITUTION	North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Chicago, IL. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	70p.; For related documents, see HE 021 162-165. Updates ED 274 250.
AVAILABLE FROM	North Central Association, 159 N. Dearborn, Chicago, IL 60601 ($4.00).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions); Administrative Organization; College Administration; *College Planning; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Organizational Objectives; *School Visitation
IDENTIFIERS	*Site Visits

ABSTRACT

This manual is intended to guide institutions of higher education and evaluation teams through the evaluation visit by, and the subsequent processes of, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. The manual is divided into the following chapters: (1) institutional preparations for the visit (preparations that must be made beginning 2 years before the visit); (2) team preparations for the visit (including lines of communication, analysis of written materials, and the Commission staff); (3) conducting the evaluation visit (including evaluation team role, meetings and conferences, and the exit interview); (4) the team report (including structure, evaluation for affiliation, advice for institutional improvement, the team recommendation, and drafting of the report); (5) the review processes (institutional response, readers' panel, and review committee); (6) focused evaluations; and (7) special cases. Seven appendices provide the general institutional requirements and the evaluative criteria, a sample timeline, institutional materials, sample evaluation visit summary sheet, a planning checklist for the team chairperson, a sample title page for the team report, and a sample Statement of Affiliation Status (SAS) worksheet. An index of Commission policies and a list of Commission members and staff are also provided. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291296

NCA

A MANUAL FOR THE EVALUATION VISIT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Comm on Inst. of H.E.
North Central Assoc. of Colleges & Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
1988-89

HE 021 163

The information contained in this document is accurate as of January 1, 1988. If substantive changes in policy or procedure occur before the next edition, institutions affiliated with the Commission and consultant-evaluators will be notified. ©1988 by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Additional copies of this document can be ordered from: North Central Association, 159 N. Dearborn, Chicago IL 60601. $4.00.

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

159 North Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601

(312) 263-0456 (800) 621-7440

1988-89

CONTENTS

	PREFACE	v
I.	**INSTITUTIONAL PREPARATIONS FOR THE VISIT**	1
	Choosing the Dates for the Visit	1
	The Selection of the Evaluation Team	2
	Conflict of Interest	2
	Observers	3
	Logistical Arrangements	3
	Budgeting	4
	The Written Materials	4
	Making the Most of the Evaluation Visit	5
II.	**TEAM PREPARATIONS FOR THE VISIT**	7
	Establishing Lines of Communication	7
	Planning for the Visit	7
	Analyzing the Written Materials	8
	The Commission Staff and the Team Visit	10
III.	**CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION VISIT**	11
	The Role of the Evaluation Team	11
	Length of the Visit	12
	The First Team Meeting	12
	Conferences with the Executive Officer	14
	Data Gathering and Evaluation	15
	Team Meetings	17
	The Exit Interview	18
	Team Expenses	19
IV.	**THE TEAM REPORT**	20
	Preparing the Team Report	20
	Structure of the Report	21
	The Introduction	21
	Evaluation for Affiliation	22
	Advice for Institutional Improvement	23
	The Team Recommendation	25
	The Recommendation Sentence	25
	The Rationale	26
	Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status	26
	Status	26
	Educational Programs	28
	Locations	28
	Stipulations	30
	Reports Due	30
	Focused Evaluations	31
	Comprehensive Evaluation	31

The Format of the Team Report 32
The Draft Team Report 33
The Final Team Report 33

V. THE REVIEW PROCESSES 34
Institutional Response to the Team Report 34
The Readers' Panel 34
The Review Committee 35

VI. FOCUSED EVALUATIONS 38
Planning the Visit 38
Conducting the Visit 39
Writing the Report 39
Review Processes and Commission Action 41

VII. SPECIAL CASES 42
Pre-Visits 42
Sequential Visits 42
Interregional Visits 43
Joint Visits 43
Generalist Visits 43
Confirmation Visits 44

APPENDIX A: The General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria 45

APPENDIX B: A Sample Timeline for the Evaluation Process 48

APPENDIX C: Institutional Materials for the Evaluation 50

APPENDIX D Sample Evaluation Visit Summary Sheet 52

APPENDIX E: A Planning Checklist for the Team Chairperson 53

APPENDIX F: A Sample Title Page for the Team Report 54

APPENDIX G: A Sample SAS Worksheet 55

INDEX OF COMMISSION POLICIES 57

THE COMMISSION AND THE COMMISSION STAFF 61

PREFACE

The Commission staff have prepared this 1988-89 edition of *A Manual for the Evaluation Visit* to guide institutions and teams through the evaluation visit and subsequent Commission processes. Together with the *Handbook of Accreditation* and *Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation,* it provides institutions, team chairpersons, and team members with a description of the principles, policies and procedures which currently govern the Commission's accreditation process. The *Handbook* is the core of this set of documents, and both this *Manual* and the *Guide* assume their reader's familiarity with it. All three documents are revised and republished on a regular basis. Significant changes in policies and procedures occurring between publications are reported in the Commission's *Briefing* newsletter. Questions about current policies and procedures should be directed to the Commission office.

With this edition of the Commission's documents, much of the detail of the evaluation process has been incorporated in the *Manual*, making the *Manual* a critical document for **both** the institution and the team in understanding Commission policies and procedures and in having realistic expectations for the evaluation visit. This edition also includes new references to comprehensive evaluations with special emphases. The *Manual* is organized as follows:

- **Chapter I** is a new chapter which reviews the preparations the institution will need to make for the team visit beginning two years before the visit.

- **Chapter II** informs the team, and especially the team chair, about the early and thorough planning that is an integral part of every successful visit.

- **Chapter III** describes the evaluation visit.

- **Chapter IV** treats the Team Report. While the report is ultimately written by the team chair, all members of the team need to be fully conversant with the information this chapter contains since they are responsible for drafting sections of the report and submitting them to the chair. **Since team chairpersons are asked to organize their reports—and especially their recommendations—in a specific format, this chapter should be read with special care.** (Note: this edition includes revised information on the team's SAS recommendation, particularly related to the timing of the next comprehensive evaluation.)

- **Chapter V** has been expanded to provide a detailed description of the review processes of the Commission.

- **Chapter VI** discusses all of the aspects of preparing for, conducting and reporting a focused evaluation which differ from those for comprehensive evaluations. All those involved in a comprehensive evaluation will want to read the entire *Manual;* those involved in focused evaluations will need to read Chapter VI with special care.

- **Chapter VII** provides information on special types of visits.

A series of timelines, checklists, and sample documents are now included as appendices to the *Manual* to assist institutions and teams in preparing for the visit.

The *Handbook*, *Guide*, and *Manual* include an index which tells the reader where information on the Commission's various policies can be found in each of the documents.

The Commission staff hope that this *Manual*, together with the *Handbook* and *Guide*, will answer most of the questions team chairs, team members and institutions will have about this process. Please notify us if they do not.

CHAPTER I

INSTITUTIONAL PREPARATIONS FOR THE VISIT

Choosing the Dates for the Visit

When the Commission sends its reminder letter approximately two years before a scheduled evaluation, it asks the institution to choose dates for the visit. At this point, the Commission asks for those dates not to lock the institution into the Commission's schedule, but to encourage the institution to develop a solid timeline for its preparations. When the second reminder letter is sent approximately one year before the visit, the Commission needs to have the original dates confirmed or changed. Only in rare circumstances will the Commission set visit dates on its own.

In choosing the dates for the visit, an institution should be sure that its faculty and administration will be available, that students will be in classes, and that other scheduled campus activities will not make it hard for the team to do its work. If the visit includes a request for changes in the Statement of Affiliation Status or if it is for initial candidacy or initial accreditation, the institution will want to think carefully about the date of final Commission action (perhaps several months after the evaluation visit) and choose an appropriate date for the visit. Institutions should also check the schedule of professional meetings which might involve people from the campus or members of the team (e.g., the NCA Annual Meeting, AACJC, AAHE). The Commission calendar of Review Committees, Commission meetings and the Annual Meeting is published in the *Briefing* newsletter.

Experience has shown that teams prefer visits which begin on Monday. This allows them to travel on Sunday (some even take advantage of less expensive airplane fares and travel on Saturday) and be back on their home campuses at the end of the last day of the visit.

On rare occasions rescheduling is necessary close to the time of the visit. When significant events occur beyond the control of the institution and the Commission, the Commission staff should be notified immediately and be given the opportunity to decide in consultation with the institution whether the visit should proceed as planned.

The Selection of the Evaluation Team

For some time prior to most comprehensive evaluation visits, the institution and the Commission staff member assigned to it have been making specific preparations. The institution has engaged in an intensive self-study process and is organizing its findings into a written Self-Study Report; the staff member has assisted the institution in that process. Together, they have established a plan for the self-study, worked out a timetable, and set the dates for the evaluation visit.

During the year before the visit, the institution is asked to indicate the areas of expertise and kinds of institutions it would like to see represented on the evaluation team. With those suggestions in mind, the staff member working with the institution attempts to compose a well-balanced team from among the members of the Consultant-Evaluator Corps. (In exceptional cases where an institutional evaluation requires professional background that no current member of the Corps has, the staff may suggest educators from outside of the Corps or outside of the region to serve on a particular evaluation team.)

Several months before the visit is to take place, the staff member sends a list of proposed evaluation team members to the Executive Officer of the institution for comment. This list is accompanied by **Professional Data Forms** providing information on each proposed team member's present position, experience, and areas of expertise. The institution is invited to express any concerns or reservations it may have about any of the proposed team members, and these concerns are considered when the Commission staff member develops the final team. While the Commission reserves the right to make the final choice of all evaluation teams, it makes every effort to alleviate serious institutional concerns. Any subsequent changes in the team's makeup because of such things as scheduling conflicts and emergencies are also made in consultation with the institution.

Conflict of Interest

In an effort to guard against conflict of interest in the Commission's processes, staff construct all teams within specific Commission guidelines:

- normally, no member will have visited the institution as a North Central evaluator within the previous five years, unless the institution explicitly approves such participation;
- no member of the team will currently be from the institution's own home state;

- no member of the team will have been a recent appointee or employee of the institution, or will have close relatives who are appointees or employees of the institution;
- no member of the team will have been a graduate of the institution;
- no member of the team will have expressed personal opinions bearing on the accreditability of the institution.

Since staff cannot know of every possible conflict of interest, the Consultant-Evaluators themselves are asked to refuse a team invitation if any conflict of interest might be possible.

In addition, Commission policy stipulates that team members should not serve as consultants to the institution during the year following the official action on the evaluation visit. To do so will result in the evaluator's removal from the C-E Corps.

While it is possible that some team members will find they know one another or have served together on other teams, it is just as likely that the team members will be meeting and working with one another for the first time. While it is possible that a team member might know someone at the institution being visited, it is also likely that team members are seeing an institution and its people for the first time.

Observers

From time to time institutions ask if observers—representatives from national church boards or state regents, for example—can be present during the team visit. While the Commission does not encourage the practice, its staff will consider each request on a case-by-case basis. Both the team chair and the institution must agree that the observer can be present. The team chair must assure that the observer does not participate in the team's final decision.

Logistical Arrangements

The Executive Officer will be asked by the team chair to make hotel reservations for the team. If possible, a meeting room should be reserved at the hotel for team meetings. A meeting and work room will also be needed on campus. That meeting room should include institutional materials the team will need for review and reference. (See Appendix C of this *Manual*.) Secretarial assistance is also desirable; in recent years some teams have sought ready access to a PC.

The institution will want to arrange with the team about meetings with key personnel—members of the governing board; representatives of the state coordinating board or other related agency;

faculty representatives; student representatives; alumni and community leaders. The institution should announce the visit and the availability of the team to confer with institutional personnel during "open time."

Budgeting

Most of the Commission visits are billed in accordance with a fixed fee schedule. When it pays that fee, the institution has no more financial responsibilities for the team's transportation, housing, and meals. Institutions might choose to host a dinner or social hour one night of the visit; typically such an event is small and allows the team to accomplish some of its work (e.g., a dinner meeting with Trustees or department chairs); institutions pay for those events. An institution is not obligated to transport the team during the visit, but if it does provide a car or livery service, it absorbs those costs.

In budgeting for the evaluation, an institution should include: (1) the fixed fee, (2) costs of printing the report and other documents, (3) its limited entertainment expenses, and (4) overhead such as released time, secretarial help, costs of gathering data, and special equipment. Some visits require a Review Committee appearance (initial candidacy and initial accreditation); the institution should budget for travel and lodging for two or three people to come to Chicago.

Team members expect to pay for their own expenses. Institutions should not attempt to pay bills which clearly belong to the team, for such attempts simply lead to misunderstandings which interfere with the visit.

The Written Materials

The institution prepares sets of materials for use during the evaluation process. Each set for a comprehensive evaluation includes: (1) the appropriate Self-Study Report; (2) completed Basic Institutional Data forms (sent to the institution by the Commission a year before the visit) which provide a summary of statistical information concerning finances, enrollment trends, etc.; (3) the latest institutional catalog(s); and (4) faculty and student handbooks.

The general formula for determining the number of sets needed for the evaluation process is as follows:

- one set for the Commission office
- one set for each member of the evaluation team

- review process
  - — three sets for the Readers' Panel process
  - — up to twelve sets for the Review Committee process
- any number of sets the institution wishes to produce for its own use

The institution sends one set to the Commission **two months** before the visit and one set directly to each team member at least **one month** before the visit. In addition, the institution sets aside in an office on campus relevant supporting documents for use by the evaluation team (see Appendix C).

The office of the Commission sends to the institution and each member of the evaluation team the Evaluation Visit Summary Sheet, a copy of the institution's Statement of Affiliation Status and Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status, the official record of the most recent comprehensive visit, the official record of any focused visits that have taken place and/or institutional changes approved by the Commission since the last comprehensive evaluation, and an expense voucher. Additional materials will be available to team members during their evaluation (see Appendix C).

Making the Most of the Evaluation Visit

It should go without saying that the institutions which derive the greatest benefit from evaluation visits are those who have a clear and accurate sense of their strengths and their problems. They are also the institutions which have prepared the total institutional community for the visit.

Many teams mix formal and informal interviews; they might meet in a scheduled session with student government leaders, for example, but they might also simply scatter themselves through the cafeteria during lunch and talk with random groups of students. Too frequently people on campus expect that all team contacts will be through formal, scheduled interviews, and they forego the open meetings and wait for team members to come to them. Teams have limited time and extensive responsibilities, and even the tightest schedule will not allow teams to spend time with everyone on campus. Teams also have to spend considerable time simply reading materials and, therefore, they will not be interacting constantly with people on the campus.

People at an institution should understand the typical flow of a team visit; they should know the people who definitely will be

interviewed; they should know when the team will hold open meetings. They should also feel free to speak with the institutional coordinator of the visit if, during the visit, they are concerned that the team appears to be overlooking an important aspect of the institution. While the institution cannot tell the team how to conduct its visit, it can certainly express to the chair of the team any concerns it might have as the visit is progressing.

Teams fill a dual role: they certify and they consult. When teams are struggling to uncover information related to certification, they tend not to be as open in their consulting capacities. When they do provide informal observations and advice, these are sometimes misinterpreted and a comment is taken as an indictment. The best advice for an institution is to wait for the exit interview and the written report to see the team's final evaluation. Those two formal parts of the visit will place many of the informal interchanges in a clearer context.

Teams cannot solve major problems; teams cannot resolve internal squabbles. Institutions which politicize the visit only make it harder for the team to conduct as objective a review as possible. An Executive Officer of an institution experiencing tension is best advised to do everything possible to assist the team in understanding clearly and easily the major factors contributing to the tension; efforts to coopt the team seldom succeed and usually cast the whole visit in an unfortunate light.

Clear communication, realistic expectations, community preparation, and open cooperation: these are the secrets to making a team visit as productive to an institution as possible.

CHAPTER II

TEAM PREPARATIONS FOR THE VISIT

Establishing Lines of Communication

Once team members accept an evaluation assignment, the Commission formally notifies the institution and the team and distributes an **Evaluation Visit Summary Sheet** (EVSS). This document provides a capsule description of both the institution and the visit, including the names, addresses and telephone numbers of the executive officer, the team members, and the Commission staff member coordinating the evaluation. (See Appendix D.)

When notified that the team is complete, the team chair is asked to contact the institution's Executive Officer to make arrangements for the visit. (Team members should not contact the institution individually.) Together, the chairperson and the Executive Officer identify the key people at the institution who will be interviewed during the team visit, make arrangements for the team's hotel accommodations, agree on the materials and facilities that will be at the team's disposal while they are on campus, and discuss any other aspects of the visit that need to be worked out beforehand. Because teams are often completed months before a visit is scheduled to occur, the team chair should make an initial contact with the institution and the team soon after the team is complete to let them know when more specific details of the visit will be forthcoming. If subsequent changes in the team are made, care should be taken by the team chair to use the most recent EVSS in communicating with the team.

In special cases, the chair may also arrange for a pre-visit if the institution requests it and the Commission staff concurs. Pre-visits are scheduled only when an institution believes that its structure or geographical locations will require special advance discussion of a substantial kind. (See Chapter VII.)

Planning for the Visit

In addition to an Evaluation Visit Summary Sheet, the team chair receives a **Professional Data Form** on each of the team members. These forms provide information about the background and competencies of each member of the team.

The team chair writes to the team members to inform them of preliminary arrangements for the visit. Throughout the planning

process, the team chair keeps team members informed of how arrangements are progressing. Team members will need information about when they should arrive, where they will be housed, the time and place of their first team meeting, when they can expect to finish their work, and a variety of other practical matters. **Team members are expected to arrive in time for the first team meeting and to stay the full number of days scheduled for the visit, departing shortly after the exit interview.**

The team chair should also use the Professional Data Form information to develop a tentative evaluation plan and division of responsibilities. **If the team includes a new member of the corps, the chair should arrange for that person to work with more experienced members of the team.** By sharing the plan with the team some weeks before the visit, the chair might make important adjustments before the first team meeting. The chair should stress that *each* team member is to become familiar with *all* of the institution's written materials before the visit takes place.

Since each member's familiarity with Commission policies and procedures will differ, one of the chairperson's major responsibilities throughout the visit will be to orient the team to the Commission's philosophy and practices. The *Handbook of Accreditation*, *Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation*, and this *Manual* are required reading for every team member. In addition, the Commission staff may distribute specific policy statements which apply to a particular evaluation. The team chair must serve as the on-site guide for the application and interpretation of these documents as bases for the team's evaluation and recommendation.

Analyzing the Written Materials

Before the visit, team members carefully examine all of the materials they have received from the institution and the Commission. The institution's written Self-Study Report is especially important as a primary source of information for the evaluation. Since this report reflects the design of a self-study process that has usually taken many months, it is important that each member of the team understand the nature of that design. *The Self-Study Report may be framed in a variety of ways.* The report may be comprehensive, comprehensive with certain emphases, or topical. It may also be built around a current special institutional study or around documents that have been produced by a regular institutional research program. The Commission staff will make any special aspects (such as special emphases) of the self-study design known to the team, and the institution will describe them in the report itself.

The Self-Study Report is the team's basic reference during the visit, since the report is required to demonstrate clearly and explicitly that the institution satisfies the Evaluative Criteria for Candidacy or the Evaluative Criteria for Accreditation. As they read it before the visit, the chairperson and the team members will want to ask themselves a number of questions, including:

- Does the Report show that the institution has engaged in a genuine, useful self-study process?
- Does the report contain the information required by the Commission? (See *Guide*, Chapter IV.)
- Is the report sufficiently evaluative, or is it primarily descriptive?
- Does it adequately demonstrate that the institution fulfills *each* of the Evaluative Criteria for Candidacy or Accreditation? If it does not, what further information is required? What needs amplification, clarification or special examination?
- Does it adequately demonstrate that the General Institutional Requirements are met?
- Are there inconsistencies between the information in the report and that in the Basic Institutional Data forms, the catalog(s), or the faculty or student handbooks?
- Are there inconsistencies between the information in the report and that included in the materials the team has received from the Commission?
- Who are the key people to interview?
- What functions, operations, or program areas deserve special attention?
- What strengths and concerns about the institution does the Self-Study Report identify? Is there a plan for responding to the concerns?

However, it is important for the team to remember that its charge is to evaluate the *institution*, not just the report. A poor Self-Study Report may make a team's task more difficult, but it does not necessarily mean that an institution does not fulfill the Criteria; a well-written Self-Study Report is not a substitute for fulfilling the Criteria.

The Commission also sends information to the team and the institution for review before the visit. The reports of the most recent comprehensive evaluation and any subsequent focused evaluations and/or institutional changes approved by the Commission will provide a basis for judging the rate and the character of the changes the institution has undergone.

After examining all of these materials before the visit, the team should be prepared to approach its first team meeting with a clear idea of questions and areas it will want to discuss and examine during the evaluation.

The Commission Staff and the Team Visit

Just as the staff provide assistance to institutions in preparing for the evaluation, they also provide assistance as needed to team chairs and team members. Well before the visit is conducted, the team chair should indicate to the staff any questions about the size and/or competencies of the team. During the visit, the team chair should call the Commission office to clarify Commission policy, to discuss special situations, and/or to confirm that the team is accurately describing the Commission's processes. In preparing the Team Report, the team chair may seek advice from the Commission staff concerning its organization and content. The team chair is asked to send copies of any correspondence related to the evaluation to the Commission staff member assigned to the institution.

Because the Commission believes that the accreditation process must be based on the principle of peer review, a member of the Commission staff rarely joins an evaluation team, and then only as an observer and with the institution's approval.

CHAPTER III

CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION VISIT

The Role of the Evaluation Team

The evaluation team has two primary functions consistent with the Commission's purposes. They are: a) evaluating the institution to determine whether the General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria are met and, on the basis of that evaluation, recommending that accreditation or candidacy be granted, continued or denied, and b) offering advice and suggestions for institutional improvement. The seriousness of these responsibilities, their importance to many people both within and outside the institution, hardly needs to be emphasized.

The team is charged neither with enforcing government regulations nor with measuring an institution against a uniform set of standards or preconceptions. Instead, it is asked to exercise its collective judgment to assess an institution's clarity of purpose, organization of resources, educational effectiveness, and ability to continue to function. The team begins with *the institution's own stated mission and purposes* as a postsecondary educational institution and evaluates how that mission and those purposes are being realized. Approaching each institution on these terms, the team evaluates it in relation to the Commission's Criteria. (See *Handbook*, Chapter II, and *Guide*, Chapter III.)

When it has completed its evaluation, the team formulates its accrediting recommendation and summarizes its findings in a written Team Report. Like the institutional Self-Study Report to which it is, in part, a reaction, this Team Report must contain certain essential elements. (See Chapter IV.) The team's report becomes a crucial part of the written record which members of the Commission's review process, Executive Commissioners, and members of the next evaluation team to the institution consider in making their own recommendations and decisions.

Once they have submitted their comments on the draft report, team members' responsibilities for the Commission assignment are fulfilled. They will receive a copy of the final report and will be notified of the final action taken by the Commission, but they are represented during the review processes of the Commission by the team chair. Should they receive comments or questions from or about the institution they have visited, they should refer that person to the Commission or the team chair. **Under no circumstances**

should they discuss the details of the team's deliberations or try to speak for the team.

To evaluate. To advise. To recommend. To report. To respect professional obligations of confidentiality. These are the responsibilities of the evaluation team. To fulfill them well, the team's chair and the team's members must see that the visit is as carefully planned and conducted as their report is carefully written.

Length of the Visit

An evaluation for initial or continued accreditation or initial candidacy normally lasts three days; an evaluation for continued candidacy usually lasts two. The day before the visit is to begin and the last day of the visit are partially devoted to travel to and from the institution; the rest of the visit is totally spent on the institutional evaluation. However, if circumstances warrant it, the team chair may extend the visit beyond its scheduled length after consulting with the Commission staff.

Team members arrive the day before the visit is officially slated to begin. The team chairperson will have earlier notified each of them of the time of the initial team meeting. Together, the team chair and the Executive Officer will have decided either to arrange an informal dinner of the team to meet representatives of the institution or to leave the first evening free for the team to begin its work. If a social function is scheduled, it should be both early and brief.

The First Team Meeting

At the team's first business meeting, the chairperson should review the specific plans for the visit, establish final assignments, and **make each team member's report writing responsibilities clear.** The team chair should also use the first business meeting to clarify the team's task, concentrate its attention, and establish a unified attitude toward the evaluation. Team members should be encouraged to approach their work informally, as colleagues and peers rather than as inspectors. They should keep their attention on evaluating the institution in relation to the Evaluative Criteria and should avoid trivial detours. To see only flaws and weaknesses, or to compare everything to one's home campus, will distort the evaluation and distract the team from its central responsibility of approaching the institution it terms of *its own objectives.*

With these ideas and objectives in mind, the team chair usually establishes an agenda for the first team meeting that looks something like this:

- **Orientation.** Review the General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria, the *Handbook of Accredi-*

tation, the Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation, this *Manual,* and the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status. Remind the team that all evaluation materials, conferences, conclusions and recommendations are to be kept confidential.

- **Preliminary Impressions.** Have an open exchange of preliminary reactions to the written materials the team has studied. Allow each member of the team to share his or her analysis of the materials and identify any areas of conflicting opinion. Guard against *a priori* conclusions, but use this discussion to establish working hypotheses as points of departure for the team's first day of work.

- **Commission Policy on Institutional Practices.** Remind team members not to let themselves be drawn into debates on the relative merits of specific approaches to particular problems. As representatives of the Commission, they should make it clear that the Commission does not prescribe specific practices concerning such issues as unionization, collective bargaining, academic freedom, teaching loads, class size, departmental budgets, due process (for students and faculty), affirmative action, and institutional sponsorship of non-academic activities. Whatever their own personal biases may be, as representatives of the Commission, team members should be neither advocates nor adversaries of any particular approach to these issues. However, because the Commission expects institutions to evaluate their policies and practices on such matters, the team should include within its evaluation and subsequent report assessment of such practices if they affect the institution's ability to meet the Commission's Criteria. If individuals at the institution express particularly strong or singular views regarding the impact of a particular practice on the institution's effectiveness, their opinions should be cross-checked and verified by talking to others. *Such opinions, if not verifiable, should not be included in the report.*

- **Schedule and Assignments.** Plan individual and team activities and establish a tentative timetable for each day. Assign individual responsibilities for interviews. During most evaluations, every governing board member, every officer of the institution, every division/department head, and as many faculty members as possible should be consulted. In a small institution, every faculty member should talk to some member of the team and as many students as possible should also be interviewed. The team will usually

want to schedule and publicize some "open time" when team members will be available to speak to anyone who wants to see them. At team meetings throughout the visit, the team chair will want to check on the team's progress in interviewing campus people so that as many people as possible are seen, and no one who *must* be seen is omitted.

- **The Team Report.** Compiling the final report is the chairperson's responsibility, but **team members are expected to draft those parts of the report that the chairperson assigns them.** For the evaluation process to function on schedule, each team member must complete thoroughly and promptly the writing he or she has been asked to do. It is critical that the chair inform team members of how the report will be handled. Some team chairs prefer to have a rough draft of the Team Report completed before they leave campus; others request that sections be submitted within a week of the visit. The team chair may suggest that, while rough drafts are to be submitted by the end of the visit, anyone who wishes to write a more polished version for submission after he or she returns home is welcome to do so. But if the chair wants to have a draft report in hand before leaving the campus, it will be necessary to encourage team members to record their reactions, questions, and judgments *throughout* the visit rather than waiting until the end.

Conferences with the Executive Officer

The team's first conference on the morning the visit officially begins should be with the Executive Officer of the institution and anyone else the Executive Officer invites to attend. The Executive Officer will welcome the team, make some opening remarks about the institution and the visit, and perhaps introduce several key members of the administrative staff; the team chair will introduce the members of the team. This meeting should be more than a social occasion; it establishes the tenor of the visit. The Executive Officer should be prepared to answer any initial questions the team may want to pose, and the team should be prepared to pose them. **The Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status should be reviewed for accuracy.** It is also useful for the team chair to state officially why the team is there (e.g., "to conduct a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation at the bachelor's degree-granting level") to make certain that there is no confusion. If confusion does exist, the chairperson should contact the Commission staff immediately. The team may also use this meeting to begin to schedule appointments with various members of the administration, faculty, staff, and governing board, if this has not already been done.

Once or twice during the visit the chair should check back with the Executive Officer to ensure that appropriate interviews are being conducted. This alleviate the post-visit confusion that occurs when disagreements arise about whether certain interviews were conducted.

Many chairs find it good practice to meet with the Executive Officer before the exit interview to explain briefly the contents of the team's oral report. This is especially important if the team's recommendation will clearly be a disappointment to the institution.

Data Gathering and Evaluation

Sound recommendations and decisions on whether an institution meets the Commission's Evaluative Criteria for Accreditation or Candidacy require a firm base of accurate data and other information. No single way to assemble and analyze this information can be specified. However, there are some general principles which should guide the team during the visit.

- The team (even one participating in a comprehensive visit with special emphases) must judge the institution *as a whole*. Therefore, the team needs to make sure that it has sufficient information about the entire institution for its deliberations. On a visit with special emphases that information should be complete, even if less voluminous, and, unless the first day of the visit provides reason to doubt the accuracy of the institution's shortened summary information, the team should spend more time on the special emphases than on confirming all of the institutional information.

- Even if institutions might, teams should not ignore the most commonly overlooked aspects of an institution: its off-campus programs, its study abroad offerings, the intercollegiate athletics program, special programs offered only at certain times of the year (such as summers), and the institution's relationship to affiliated but separate organizations; in short, those activities that fall outside of the immediate day-to-day concerns of many persons on the main campus.

- Since the collection of data about an institution could be endless, the team needs to determine the extent and the kinds of data it must have to make its evaluation. This determination should be based on the level of detail appropriate to the judgment to be rendered—a judgment on the institution as a whole rather than on every single activity within it. The financial condition of the institution is important, for example, but the information the team needs about finances

typically can be found in summary audit reports rather than in extensive examination of every item of expenditure.

- If the institution has a procedure for accomplishing a particular task, the team's responsibility is to examine the procedure and its application in a few cases, not to examine each application individually as if a guiding procedure were not in place.

- Sampling, where appropriate, can be an efficient way to obtain needed information in the limited time available to a team. Sampling assumes that a few randomly chosen individual cases will represent a whole group reasonably well. The method is useful in examining a file of written information, or in choosing persons for interviews. The random choice can be done informally by simply picking a few cases here and there. Some examples of where the method can be useful are:

  — ***Faculty credentials.*** Characteristics of the faculty as a whole can be inferred from the characteristics of a few examples.

  — ***Student records.*** Examination of a few student records sheds light on whether admissions policies are followed, whether general course requirements are enforced, whether graduation requirements are met.

  — ***Library holdings.*** Spot checks of randomly selected sections of the holdings give a basis for judging the adequacy of the collection for the institution's purposes.

  — ***Follow-up records of graduates.*** The achievements of graduates (randomly selected) give insight on the success of the institution in preparing its graduates for later careers.

  — ***Student papers.*** Course papers, theses, and dissertations provide evidence of the standards to which students are held for the award of degrees.

  — ***Interviews.*** Sampling can also be used to select individual students, faculty members, administrators and persons from other groups to provide information about the views of such groups on institutional activities. The team should plan to interview a representative sample of the institution's administrators, division/ department heads, faculty, and students. Often, group interviews conducted

by individual team members are the most efficient way to talk to as many people as possible.

In many cases, the team will determine that adequate information about various aspects of the institution appears in its Self-Study Report and related documents. In such cases, informal verification of some of that information by sampling will often allow the team to use the rest of the report with confidence in its correctness and completeness. There is, after all, no point in the team's trying to collect for itself information that is already available in the institution's written documents.

The team's purpose in gathering these data is to evaluate whether the institution satisfies the Evaluative Criteria for Candidacy or Accreditation as described in the Commission's *Handbook of Accreditation* and *Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation*. Because the team also provides consulting advice, it should endeavor to base that advice on thorough evaluation of data.

Team Meetings

The chairperson should organize each team meeting carefully, deciding in advance what needs to be accomplished. Each meeting will usually include brief reports from team members on the areas they have been examining and discussion of those areas by the entire team. The team chair should encourage such discussion while assuring that everyone stick to the point. Since the team's time is limited, it should not be wasted.

A major strength of every evaluation is the exchange that goes on within the team's meetings. Team members pool their experiences and resources, stimulate and question one another, search and argue, until points are clear and consensus has been reached. In most cases, the team will make its decisions through such consensus rather than through fiat or majority vote. And part of the reason for having the team lodged in the same place is that proximity facilitates the exchange of ideas, opinions and information necessary to reach consensus.

The team chair should make sure that the team meetings run efficiently and end at a reasonable time. A closing hour for evening meetings should be set and honored. At each meeting before the last, the team should review its progress and, if necessary, revise the remainder of its schedule to pursue issues that need further clarification.

At the final team meeting, the team seeks agreement on the proposed content of its report and consensus on its formal recom-

mendation. The team chair should make clear his/her expectations of team members for the timing and content of the Team Report. In the rare case where such agreement and consensus are unattainable, one or more team members may wish to file a minority report of their own. (The kinds of recommendations a team may make, the proper wording for each, and the use of the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status are discussed in the next chapter.)

Finally, at the last team meeting the team should prepare for the exit interview with the institution's officers. It should agree on the strengths and concerns it wishes to emphasize, on whether the team chair or the various team members will present the team's views, and on what its recommendation will be. At this point, if questions are raised about the content of the recommendation or the options available, the team chair should call the Commission staff.

If at any point in these meetings team members disagree over matters of Commission policy and practice, the chair should contact the Commission office. It is a good practice to contact the office before holding an exit interview which will involve rejection of an institution's request.

The Exit Interview

Before leaving campus, the entire team meets with the Executive Officer and others the Executive Officer invites to attend to summarize its findings and report its recommendation. This exit interview should provide the institution with an oral preview of *all the major points* that will be made in the team's written report.

The team begins by outlining the strengths and concerns it has observed at the institution. It concludes by reporting what its recommendation to the Commission will be and explaining how it will fill in the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status.

It is imperative that both the content and the tone of this oral report be consistent with the written report the institution will later receive. The oral report should leave no doubt about the team's judgments and, after it, the written report should hold no surprises.

The team must accurately report what its joint recommendation will be. It should emphasize the fact that, positive or negative, the recommendation must proceed through the other Commission processes which may or may not alter it.

When the team's oral report is completed, the Executive Officer may raise questions about it. If the Executive Officer or other administrators believe that the team has been misinformed or has

misunderstood something important, they should say so, and the team should be prepared to double-check if its facts are questioned. However, both the team and the institution's representatives should avoid turning the exit interview into a debate. The institution will be given an opportunity to file a formal, written response to the final Team Report, and that response is the proper place for challenging the team's interpretations or judgments. Based on the team's presentation in the exit interview, the institution should have enough information to begin preparing its written response even before it receives the final report.

If the exit interview raises important, unresolved questions, the team may need to reconvene afterwards to reconsider some aspect of its report or recommendation. If necessary, it should take further time to clarify its position or make sure of its facts and, in extremely difficult cases, it may be necessary for the team to extend its stay to gather and assess the additional information needed. Normally, after the exit interview the team will conclude its work and leave for home.

Team Expenses

Team members receive expense vouchers before the visit. They pay their own travel, hotel, and meal expenses during the visit, and then submit their expense vouchers to the Commission office when they return to their home campuses. **Expenses should not be billed to the institution or directly to the Commission.**

CHAPTER IV

THE TEAM REPORT

Preparing the Team Report

The team chair composes the Team Report. Although the chair will draw heavily on the comments, ideas, and rough drafts of the other team members, he or she is not limited to cutting and pasting. Instead, the chair is responsible for writing a clear, concise, well-organized, and coherent document that will stand up under the careful scrutiny of a wide variety of readers. The team chair must honestly reflect the views of the team, and should indicate (without identifying individuals) any significant disagreements within it. All of the major points made in the team's oral report at the exit interview should be included in the written report. The team chair's responsibility is to compose a final report that conveys, *without modification*, the team's recommendation and its rationale for that recommendation. Thus, the chair must clearly understand what that recommendation and that rationale are.

Since the team chair is responsible for writing the Team Report in a very limited time, it is critical that he or she have rough drafts of each section of the report either before or shortly after the visit ends. If the chairperson chooses not to require that the entire report be written before leaving campus, he or she should establish a firm date when all sections are to be submitted. Team members should realize that many institutions schedule their evaluations so that they may have Commission action at a particular time. It is critical, therefore, that team reports be completed on schedule, and that team members cooperate with their chairperson by submitting their portions of the report on time.

The draft report should be completed as soon as possible after the visit, while the information and impressions of the visit are still clear and sharp. While writing, the chairperson should remember that the report is intended for a large audience—the Commission staff, the Commissioners-at-Large who will take part in the review process, the Executive Commissioners, the Executive Officer and others at the institution, the members of subsequent evaluation teams, et al. The report should, therefore, be both honest and tactful. (It should not mention individuals, for example, but should refer to positions: "the Academic Dean," not "Dean Jones.")

With the initiation of the Statement of Affiliation Status, the Commission changed the format of team reports. Therefore, pre-1982 team reports should not be used as models.

Structure of the Report

Since each institution is unique and every institution is evaluated for candidacy or accreditation in the light of its own mission and purposes, every report is different. But since each evaluation is conducted to examine an institution for the same accrediting purposes and in relation to a common set of Criteria, each report must also contain four essential elements. To fulfill its role in the accreditation process, **every Team Report must:**

- provide certain matters of information;
- specifically evaluate the institution in relation to the Evaluative Criteria for Accreditation or Candidacy and the General Institutional Requirements;
- offer advice and suggestions to the institution;
- conclude with the team's formal recommendation and its rationale for that recommendation.

The clearest way to address these four essential elements is to divide the team report into four corresponding sections.

The Introduction

A clear introduction provides the reader a context within which to read what follows. This introduction describes:

- the organization of the report;
- the accreditation history of the institution; and
- the scope and structure of this team visit.

The introduction should outline the organization of the Team Report.

Next, the introduction should summarize briefly the institution's accreditation history. It should specify when the institution first became affiliated with the Commission and/or when it was first accredited, when it last underwent a comprehensive evaluation, and what (if any) focused evaluations have been conducted since the last comprehensive evaluation.

The introduction should also briefly review how the visit was conducted (i.e., people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.). This need not be an exhaustive list of names or offices, but should give solid evidence of the completeness of the review.

Finally, the introduction should outline the scope of the visit being described in the team report. This scope has been defined by the

last official action of the Commission, and is specified in both the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status and the Evaluation Visit Summary Sheet which the team received before the visit. This section of the introduction might say that "this is the report of a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation at the master's degree-granting level which was conducted for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education on (dates of the visit)."

Evaluation for Affiliation

The second essential element of every Team Report for candidacy or accreditation is an explicit evaluation of whether the institution fulfills the Evaluative Criteria for Accreditation or the Evaluative Criteria for Candidacy. (See *Handbook*, Chapter II.)

The institution's Self-Study Report should contain a discussion of how the institution meets the **General Institutional Requirements.** The team should examine this, and if it finds that meeting the Requirements is sufficiently well documented in the Self-Study Report, it need only note in the Team Report that conclusion, and refer to the section(s) of the Self-Study Report where details can be found. If, however, the team finds deficiencies with respect to one or more of the Requirements, it must discuss these in the Team Report, and reflect its findings in the team recommendation. **Explicit review of each of the GIRs is required in evaluations for initial and continued candidacy and initial accreditation.**

In documenting that an institution does or does not satisfy the Evaluative Criteria for Accreditation or the Evaluative Criteria for Candidacy, the Team Report must evaluate the institution's mission and purposes, its resources and their organization, its programs and their success, its evidence of accomplishment, and its plans for the future. And to do this, it will need to summarize relevant details. The Team Report need not repeat all of the information that is contained in the institution's Self-Study Report, catalogs, and other materials. In some cases, the team will need to provide extended discussion and documentation to support its conclusions; in others, it will be able to refer readers to other institutional documents and briefly summarize what can be found there. In other words, the Team Report need not be a totally self-contained document, but it must clearly summarize the evidence supporting the team's judgments about every part of the Criteria.

There is no prescribed format for the organization of this section of the report (although the *Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation* suggests the areas that need to be examined to demonstrate that an institution fulfills the Evaluative Criteria). The key

point for the team chair to remember as he or she assigns writing responsibilities to team members and, ultimately, writes this section of the report is that it will be crucial to the Commission's review process after the evaluation visit; therefore, it must be clear and thorough enough to justify the team's recommendation.

For years team reports have included lists of "strengths" and "concerns." When distinguishing from the team's advice and suggestions, such lists can be a useful summary of the team's findings. But teams should be discriminating in their compilation of such lists. "Strengths" are emphasized both to commend the institution for them and to encourage it to maintain them; "concerns" are emphasized to indicate those areas which require attention either immediately or in the future. **Both "strengths" and "concerns" should be significant.** This is not the place for a long exhaustive list of every good point and every problem the team discovered. Remember that in its next Self-Study Report the institution will have to respond to the concerns the team lists in this part of the team report. Therefore, the team should attempt to summarize the most salient, distinguishing strengths and concerns.

On the basis of its evaluation the team will recommend accrediting action. If the team has identified certain deficiencies that make it impossible to certify that the institution adequately fulfills the Criteria, it must state those deficiencies clearly in this section of its report. If it believes that, in spite of major deficiencies, *on balance* the institution fulfills the Criteria, it must make clear the bases for this judgment. This section of the report, in other words, should support the recommendation the team makes; careful examination must not find them to be inconsistent.

As consultants as well as evaluators, evaluation teams are asked to offer advice and suggestions to institutions as well as to evaluate them in relation to the Criteria. The third essential element of the Team Report is a section devoted to such suggestions and advice. *This section should be clearly separate from the team's evaluation of the institution in relation to the Criteria. It should be explicitly stated that the section is advisory, and that making any changes or improvements mentioned is not a requirement of the institution's candidacy or accreditation.* Concerns that affect the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria belong in the second section of the report; suggested changes that do not directly relate to the institution's accreditation or candidacy status belong in the third.

As experienced educators, team members can often offer valuable counsel to an institution. As outsiders they can sometimes bring

an objective perspective to bear on a difficulty that the institution has not been able to clarify for itself. Teams are encouraged to offer this counsel and perspective whenever they can and to think about this section of the Team Report during their meetings on campus.

A team's suggestions vary with the institution it visits and with the type of comprehensive visit it was asked to conduct. Few general guidelines can be provided by the Commission for what should be included in this section. However, the Commission does suggest that the team chairperson prepare it with a few words of caution in mind.

- Avoid rhetorical questions (e.g., "The organization of the College requires the president to make all decisions. Is this really satisfactory?") Either raise concerns directly (e.g., "The organizational structure of the college does not provide line officers with enough decision-making authority") or make clear suggestions for change (e.g., "We suggest that the college's organizational plan place explicit responsibility for day-to-day decisions with the line officers, and that the president should review the effects of those decisions each month.")

- Avoid comments and suggestions concerning personalities within the institution ("The president's administrative style is interesting and unconventional,") even when the comments are laudatory ("The Dean of Students is doing an excellent job.") Teams should be wary of characterizing the way various persons get along with each other ("The Deans seldom communicate with each other.") The short duration of the team visit does not really allow the team to arrive at a thorough knowledge of the activities of most individuals within the institution, so it is better to relate comments and suggestions to organizational elements within the institution ("There appears to be a good rapport between student leaders and the office of the Dean of Students.")

- Avoid prescribing—as opposed to suggesting—specific solutions to problems ("The student personnel office is overworked, and an Associate Dean of Students should be appointed immediately.") It is appropriate to identify problems, but the specific solutions should be left to the discretion of the institution itself. In addition, such specific prescriptions are the elements of advice that are most often confused with accreditation requirements by institutions and readers.

- Do not propose that the institution meet standards or use guidelines of specific agencies ("The College should seek NCATE accreditation.") It is appropriate to point out that the lack of specialized accreditation sometimes handicaps graduates.

If an institution chose to emphasize special topics in its self-study, the team's report should speak directly to those topics. In such cases, the Team Report might be more pointed and specific than normal, for the institution, in choosing to emphasize special topics, has also sought from the team a response to and analysis of what was accomplished. Usually it is still important that the Team Report clearly distinguishes between the bases for the accrediting recommendation and the consulting advice sought by the institution. But when an institution and the Commission have agreed to a comprehensive evaluation with special emphases, the team should feel comfortable in shaping a report which is lengthier than normal in its consulting advice and shorter than normal in its evidence supporting the accrediting recommendation.

The Team Recommendation

The last part of every Team Report is the team's recommendation for Commission action and its rationale for that recommendation. This final section should have three related parts:

- a brief, standard recommendation sentence;
- a rationale; and
- a Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status.

The Recommendation Sentence. The team's recommendation is divided into two parts: a recommendation sentence and an attached SAS Worksheet.

The recommendation sentence, which is to begin the final section of the Team Report, should follow one of two simple models. A positive recommendation sentence for a comprehensive evaluation should read:

> **The team's recommendations for action, including its recommendation to (grant/continue) the (candidacy/accreditation) of College X, are shown on the attached Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status. The team's reasons for its recommendations are:**

A negative recommendation sentence for a comprehensive evaluation should read:

The team recommends that the (candidacy/ accreditation) of College X be (denied/ withdrawn) for the following reasons:

The Rationale. The recommendation sentence is to be followed by a section in which the team clearly states its reasons for each of its specific recommendations. The team does this by discussing its suggested version of each part of the Statement of Affiliation Status. If the team's recommendation is that a part of the current SAS remain the same, it will briefly state that that part of the SAS is still accurate. (The *Status* portion of the SAS is an exception here: in *every* case the team's candidacy or accreditation recommendation must be explained.)

If the team recommendation is that a part of the current SAS be altered, it must clearly explain its reasons for recommending the suggested alteration. If the team's recommended version of a part of the SAS differs from the institution's requested version, the team will want to take special care in explaining its rationale.

Essentially, the team's rationale for each of its recommendations will be a summary judgment supported by reference to the salient points discussed in the second section of the Team Report.

Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status. Before the visit, the team will receive a copy of the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status from the Commission. The Worksheet will include any changes requested by the institution. The team indicates its recommendations by specifying the wording it suggests for **each** part of the SAS. If it recommends a change in the current wording, it specifies that change, using the wording discussed below, in the space provided on the SAS Worksheet; if it recommends no change in the current wording, it indicates that by writing **"NO CHANGE"** in the appropriate space. A sample Worksheet appears as Appendix G of this *Manual*.

In making recommendations concerning the first two parts of the SAS—the **Name** and **Control**—the team's choices should be clear. In deciding on its recommendations and rationale for the remaining parts of the SAS, the team faces more complicated choices.

STATUS. The first and most important decision the team must make is whether the institution should be granted or continued in candidacy or accreditation status. The **Status** portion of the Worksheet is the place where this decision is recorded. (*Note:* This section may be altered by a focused visit team only if probation is being recommended.) The Worksheet describes

the institution's current status and notes any changes that the institution has requested. The team may make one of four possible recommendations concerning the institution's status:

- ***that candidacy or accreditation be granted or continued.*** The team recommends this if it finds, and the second section of its report documents, that the institution meets the General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria for Accreditation or the Evaluative Criteria for Candidacy. The team summarizes its reasons for this positive decision in the rationale section of its report. The team reflects its recommendation on the SAS Worksheet.

  John Dewey College is (accredited by/a candidate for accreditation with) the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

- ***that accreditation be continued with probation.*** The team recommends this if it finds, and the second section of its report documents, that while the institution currently meets the General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria for Accreditation, specific and vital changes are necessary for it to continue to meet them. (The Commission's policy on probation appears on pp. 40-41 of the *Handbook.)* The team summarizes within the rationale section of its report its reasons for this recommendation by detailing the areas of concern that need to be improved. It records its recommendation by (a) adding the note that "College X is on probation" to the Status portion of the SAS Worksheet, and specifying the specific conditions which led to the probation, and (b) the date for the institution's next comprehensive evaluation, at which time the institution must provide clear evidence of its progress toward ameliorating those conditions.

- ***that accreditation be denied but candidacy be continued.*** The team recommends this if it finds, and the second section of its report documents, that an institution applying for accreditation **before** the expiration of its candidacy period does not meet the Evaluative Criteria for Accreditation but continues to meet the Evaluative Criteria for Candidacy and the General Institutional Requirements. The team summarizes its reasons for this recommendation in the rationale section of its report. The team's recommendation that the institution's candidacy should remain the same is reflected on the SAS Worksheet by specifying "NO CHANGE" in the

Status section. (In exceptional cases, the team may choose to recommend that an institution applying for accreditation at *the end* of its candidacy period be denied accreditation but that its candidacy be extended for a limited time.)

- ***that candidacy or accreditation be denied or withdrawn.*** The team recommends this if it finds, and the second section of its report documents, that the institution does not meet the General Institutional Requirements and the appropriate Evaluative Criteria. In this case, the team is recommending that the institution be denied initial affiliation or that continued affiliation be withdrawn and, therefore, that the institution no longer have a Statement of Affiliation Status. Should the team make this determination, its recommendation sentence will be the one noted earlier; its reasons for this recommendation will be explained in the rationale section of its report; and it will indicate "NONE" in the Status section of the SAS Worksheet and "NOT APPLICABLE" in every other section.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS. This part of the SAS describes the institution's degree programs, should note that the institution offers courses for credit outside of its degree programs if such notation is required by the "Policy and Procedures for Offering Courses for Credit Outside of Degree Programs," and indicates if the institution offers non-credit courses as a substantial component of its educational program. (For a description of the categorization of degree types used in this section of the SAS, see *A Handbook of Accreditation*, Chapter III.) The team's recommendation concerning this part of the SAS will either be to retain the current version or to change it based upon information gathered during the visit or upon the institution's request. (Under the Commission's change policy, institutions will need Commission approval before adding degree types *not* listed here. The team should make sure, therefore, that its listing is accurate and complete.) An Educational Programs section might read:

> **The College offers programs leading to the Bachelor's (arts and sciences and professional curricula) degree and the Master's (professional curricula) degree.**

LOCATIONS. *The team should first verify the accuracy of the information currently listed in the locations section of the SAS.* It should then check whether additional locations have been added or are contemplated.

This part of the SAS should note the institution's main campus (or office), any location that has a full-time administrator assigned to it, and any other location either the institution or the team believes should be listed specifically. This part of the SAS may also generally identify locations where the institution offers various programs. (For further information on the listing of Locations on the SAS, see *Handbook*, Chapter III.)

Some institutions open and close off-campus sites regularly. The team has the responsibility to recommend whether and how the sites that are not required to be listed specifically should be reflected in the SAS:

- If the institution appears to have policies and procedures for managing such sites well, and if these policies and procedures appear to be working, the team may choose to recommend that the Commission allow the institution wide latitude in making changes in locations. In such situations the team recommends general wording, e.g., "The College also offers some courses at various sites within the state."

- If, on the other hand, the team believes that the institution should **not** be free to open and close these off-campus sites without Commission review, it should list each of the current sites in this part of the SAS Worksheet. Such a listing will require the institution to be examined under the Commission's "Policy on Changes Affecting the Affiliation Status of an Institution" before it changes these sites or adds others.

- If the team does not wish to invoke the change procedure for changes in locations which **must be listed specifically**, it may include under Stipulations such wording as, "Locations may be added or dropped provided the Commission is informed before the action is taken." When such wording is used and a location is changed staff will alter the SAS to conform to the new configuration, reporting such alteration as information not requiring Commission action.

The team summarizes its reasons for the listing of locations in the rationale section of its report. An example for listing locations on the SAS is:

> **The College offers courses and programs at its campus in Chicago, Illinois; some courses and some programs are also offered at Moline and Galena, Illinois, and at various locations within Illinois.**

In this example:

Chicago is the home campus and so is shown specifically;

Moline and Galena have full-time administrators and so are shown specifically;

the various locations within the state are shown generally;

note the wording "some courses and some programs," indicating that not all courses and programs are available at every location.

STIPULATIONS. The team may recommend any stipulations that it finds, and the second section of its report documents, are justified. Some stipulations, as described above, are permissive. Many stipulations place limits on the development of new activities or new programs within the degree types specified in the *Educational Programs* portion of the SAS; limits on the size, extent or location of certain of the institution's activities (e.g., the limitation that a particular doctoral degree program may only be offered at one site), and so forth. The team summarizes its reasons for these recommendations in the rationale section of its report and notes them on the SAS Worksheet by indicating that

> **Its (accreditation/candidacy) is limited to (nature of limitation).**

REPORTS DUE. The team may recommend that the institution be required to file reports with the office of the Commission between evaluations if it finds, and the second section of its report documents, that such reports are warranted. In deciding to require reports, the team must respect the following guidelines:

- the topic(s) to be addressed in a report must be clear, specific, and preferably no more than three in number;
- the subject(s) of the report(s) must be able to be evaluated on the basis of written materials alone and must not require an evaluation visit to be verified;
- a specific date on which the report is to be filed must be indicated in the recommendation;
- no more than three reports may be recommended by any team (multiple reports on a single topic are considered one report).

The team may ask that a report be filed for a number of reasons: to provide information only, to monitor how an institution is progressing in coping with certain changes or concerns, or to determine whether a focused evaluation should be conducted. The team should specify in the **rationale** section of its report which of these purposes is behind its recommendation. It is especially important that the team specify how the report should be used. It may want to indicate in its rationale, for example, that a report should be filed on a certain date and that "unless the report shows ... then ... ." The team should clearly explain the basis for evaluating the report and the actions that the report should trigger.

The team reflects its recommendations on the institution's SAS Worksheet by noting that

> **The College is to file a report by November 1, 1991, focused on: 1) opening Fall enrollments from 1988-91; and 2) the trend in the Current Fund Balance from June 30, 1988, to June 30, 1991.**

FOCUSED EVALUATIONS. The team may recommend that one or more focused evaluations be conducted before the next comprehensive evaluation if it finds, and the second section of its report documents, that such evaluations are warranted. If it decides that a focused evaluation is necessary, the subject(s) of the focused evaluation(s) must be specific, clear, and limited in number.

The team specifies in the **rationale** section of its report the reasons for the focused visit and any specific comments related to the focused visit. The team reflects its recommendation on the SAS Worksheet by noting that

> **The College is scheduled for an evaluation in 1993-94 focused on the success of the College in improving its financial condition and its development at the graduate level.**

For additional information on the focused evaluation, see Chapter V of the *Guide* and Chapter VI of this *Manual*.

COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION. The team must recommend a time for the next comprehensive evaluation.

Commission policy requires that a comprehensive evaluation be scheduled no later than five years after an institution is granted **initial** accreditation, and that every institution affiliated with the Commission must undergo a comprehensive evaluation at least every ten years. Candidates for Accredita-

tion must be evaluated **biennially** during their candidacy period. The fact that focused evaluations may occur between comprehensive evaluations does not affect these minimum guidelines.

When making its decision about the timing of the next comprehensive evaluation, the team should consider the following questions:

- When should the Commission next review the accreditability of the institution?
- What compelling factors exist that would indicate that the institution should undergo a comprehensive evaluation in less than ten years?

If the institution is experiencing some significant problems which need immediate attention, then a comprehensive evaluation might be called for within the next five years. If, however, the institution is basically sound, but facing the same uncertainties confronted by most institutions, then the decennial cycle is probably most appropriate. Increasingly, evaluation teams are placing comprehensive evaluations on decennial cycle and using reports and focused visits to provide appropriate Commission monitoring.

In addition, the teams should keep in mind that, while most comprehensive evaluations are scheduled for fixed times as specified in the Commission's official accrediting actions, the Commission reserves the right to alter the time of the next evaluation visit or to call for a report or an evaluation to respond to changes that occur within an institution. Nothing is so misunderstood as the dating of comprehensive evaluations, and the team bears the burden of providing a concise and convincing explanation for its recommendation.

The team explains its reasons for recommending the number of years it does in the **rationale section** of its report. It reflects its recommendation on the SAS Worksheet by noting that

> **John Dewey College's most recent comprehensive evaluation occurred in 1988-89. Its next comprehensive evaluation is scheduled for 1998-99.**

The Format of the Team Report

The Team Report should be typed, double-spaced, on 8-1/2 x 11 paper. The title page should follow the format of the sample in Appendix F. The name of the institution should appear at the top

left of each page, the page number at the top right. Left-hand margins should be wide enough to allow for holes to be punched so that the report may be placed in a binder if that should be necessary during the review process. The team chair should send the Commission the **original** of the final report with the SAS Worksheet attached. Because Commission processes often require multiple copies, the clear original must be in the Commission files. The Commission staff will retype the SAS Worksheet recommendations for the final report.

The Draft Team Report

As explained earlier, team members submit their written contributions to the Team Report to the team chair either at the end of the visit or within a week after it. When all of these written materials have been received, the team chair prepares the draft report.

The draft should be completed and distributed by the team chair **within one month** of the visit. The team chair concludes the report with the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status containing the team's recommendation.

The draft should be clearly marked on the title page **"Draft for correction of errors of fact only—for internal distribution at the discretion of the Executive Officer."** The team chairperson then mails a copy of the draft report for comments and corrections to the Executive Officer of the institution, the members of the team, and the Commission staff member who has coordinated the visit. The team chair should be notified immediately of any needed changes so that the final report can be produced.

The Final Team Report

After receiving the comments of the Executive Officer, the team members, and the Commission staff, the team chair prepares the final Team Report. If the comments suggest that substantive changes may have to be made in the draft, the team chair may need to confer by telephone with the members of the team before preparing the final version. The Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status incorporating any changes in wording that have been suggested by the staff is attached to the final Team Report and is the team's formal recommendation for Commission action. When the final report is completed, the team chair sends it to the Commission staff member. The final Team Report is due in the office of the Commission **no more than six weeks** after the visit.

The Commission office duplicates the final report and mails copies of it to the Executive Officer and all members of the team. Additional copies are prepared for later distribution during the Commission's review processes.

CHAPTER V

THE REVIEW PROCESSES

The next step in the evaluation process following the team visit is the review process. The Commission has established two processes for the review of institutional evaluations: the **Readers' Panel** and the **Review Committee.** Institutions undergoing evaluations for continued candidacy or accreditation or focused evaluations are asked to choose the process they prefer. If there is no substantial disagreement between the institution and the team concerning the team recommendations, the institution typically chooses the Readers' Panel; if there is, it asks to be considered by a Review Committee. Review Committee consideration is required if the evaluation is for either initial candidacy or initial accreditation, or if the team recommends probation.

Institutional Response to the Team Report

The Executive Officer of the institution is asked to review the Team Report, including the team's recommendation, and to make a formal written response to the Commission staff member. This response serves the institution in the ensuing review processes by providing an institutional commentary on the findings of the team. In evaluations for continued accreditation and focused visits, it also serves as the institution's selection of review processes.

The institution's response, which is shared with the team, becomes part of the written record of the evaluation and is forwarded to the Readers' Panel and/or the Review Committee, and, if appropriate, to the Commission. As a part of the official record of the visit, it is shared with the next evaluation team.

The institution's response should be received by the Commission staff within two weeks of receipt of the final Team Report. If an institution wishes more time to respond, it should contact the staff.

The Readers' Panel

A Readers' Panel composed of three Commissioners-at-Large conducts an independent review of all written materials resulting from an evaluation. Readers receive copies of the Team Report from the Commission. When it receives the names of panel members from the Commission, the institution sends each of them a complete set of its materials, including its response to the Team Report.

The Readers' Panel process has one purpose: to determine whether further discussion with a Review Committee is likely to lead to alteration of the team's Statement of Affiliation Status recommendation. The Readers cannot alter the Team Report or its recommendation. An institution selecting the Readers' Panel process cannot request changes in the wording of the Team Report or recommendation.

In making their judgments, Readers consider the following questions:

- Is the team's recommendation adequately supported by factual information in the team report and the institution's documents?
- Do the institution's report and supporting documents contain information that is not addressed in the team report, and which might significantly affect the recommendation for action?
- Does the institution's response indicate significant disagreement with the team's recommendation, making further review desirable?
- Does the institution's response contain significant new information that is likely to change the recommendation?

If at least two of the three readers believe that Review Committee consideration is not likely to lead to alteration of the team's recommendation, the team recommendation is forwarded directly to the Commission for action. The Commission then has the option of accepting the team's recommendation or referring the institution to a Review Committee for further consideration.

If at least two of the three readers believe that Review Committee consideration is likely to lead to alteration of the team's recommendation, the institution is scheduled to appear at a Review Committee session for further consideration.

If the institution chooses the Readers' Panel process, the team chair is informed of the Readers' responses to the Team Report.

The Review Committee

Review Committees consider all institutions required to go through this process, all those who choose it, and all those referred to a Review Committee by the Readers' Panel or the Commission. A Review Committee must have at least seven members, a majority of whom should be Commissioners-at-Large. The team chair

is asked to appear with the Executive Officer of the institution before the Committee to discuss the institution's materials, the evaluation visit, and the team's report and recommendation. If the evaluation is considered by a Review Committee and the team chair is unable to attend, a team member will be asked to represent the team at the session.

Before the Review Committee meeting the Commission office provides the institution with the names of the Committee's members. The institution sends each Committee member a complete set of institutional materials; the Commission sends each a copy of the Team Report. If the institution has been referred to the Review Committee by a Readers' Panel, the Commission sends Committee members copies of the Readers' comments. Before the Review Committee meeting, the institution may also add any other written information it believes the Committee should have to evaluate the team's recommendation. Written materials cannot be presented at the Review Committee meeting.

Through studying the documents connected with the evaluation visit and through discussion with the team chair and the Executive Officer, the Review Committee judges whether the evaluation team's recommendation is well-founded in fact, is fair, and is in agreement with the policies and procedures of the Commission. During this meeting, the institution and the team chair have an opportunity to provide additional information by making brief oral presentations and answering the questions of the Review Committee's members. Audio-visual presentations are not permitted in the Review Committee meeting. When there is a disagreement between the institution and the team, the Committee seeks to understand and resolve it. The Review Committee members may ask the team chair to elaborate on something in the Team Report, to explain the deliberations that led to a particular recommendation, or to react to institutional materials that may have been submitted in response to the Team Report.

The Review Committee then meets in closed session to consider the information it has gained. It recommends either support or alteration of the visiting team's recommendation and provides written reasons for its recommendation. Review Committees cannot alter the contents of the team report.

Following the Review Committee sessions, the Review Committee's recommendation and rationale are communicated to the team chair and the Executive Officer. Both are invited to respond in writing. Should a Review Committee change the team recommendation, the team chair may choose to poll the team before send-

ing a response. If there is disagreement by the team and/or the institution with the Review Committee recommendation, these comments are presented to the Commission along with the institution's materials, the Team Report and recommendation, and the Review Committee's recommendation.

If the Review Committee recommends support of the team's recommendation, then the Commission has the option of adopting the recommendation or referring it to a Review Committee for further consideration. If the Review Committee recommends changes in the team's recommendation, the Commission then has the option of accepting or altering the team and Review Committee recommendations. The Commission's action is communicated to the team chair and the team members shortly after it is taken.

At the conclusion of the review process, the team chair's responsibilities for this assignment end.

CHAPTER VI

FOCUSED EVALUATIONS

The information on planning, conducting and reporting the results of an evaluation visit which appears in the preceding pages of this *Manual* is necessary reading for every team undertaking an evaluation for the Commission. Focused evaluations alter the scope of the institution's preparation and materials for the visit, as well as the nature of the team's evaluation and report. As Chapter V of *A Handbook of Accreditation* explains, focused evaluations occur between comprehensive evaluations and examine only certain aspects of an institution. They are meant to monitor developments, changes or concerns between comprehensive visits. In most respects, the policies and procedures governing such evaluations are similar to those governing comprehensive evaluations; however, there are a number of significant differences.

The first of these is that the role of the evaluation team is different from that of a team conducting a comprehensive evaluation. The focused evaluation team is not charged with evaluating whether an institution fulfills the Criteria for Accreditation; nor is it empowered to recommend that candidacy or accreditation be granted, continued or denied. It can, in special circumstances, recommend that the sanction of probation be applied. Its basic role is to evaluate the areas specified as the focus of the visit and to provide the Commission with a progress report on developments at the institution since the last comprehensive evaluation.

Planning the Visit

In preparation for a focused evaluation, an institution does not undertake a full-scale self-study; nor does it prepare a Self-Study Report of the kind referred to in the Commission's *Handbook* and *Guide*. It prepares a focused report, which addresses only the areas to be evaluated. It will not be organized around the Criteria as Self-Study Reports are. (For further information on the focused report, see Chapter V of *A Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation.)*

Before the visit, the Commission sends team members an Evaluation Visit Summary Sheet, a Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status, and copies of the official record of the most recent comprehensive evaluation and any subsequent focused

evaluations. The institution sends each member of the team a copy of its focused report and any supporting materials it believes the team should have before arriving on campus, including relevant portions of the Commission's Basic Institutional Data Forms, catalogs, and faculty and student handbooks.

The team chair proceeds as he or she would for a comprehensive evaluation: by initiating contact with the institution and the team, coordinating arrangements for the visit, and communicating the plan for the visit to both the institution and the team members.

Conducting the Visit

Focused evaluations are usually two-day visits. At the first team meeting, the chairperson reviews the purpose of the visit; formulates final assignments; and covers the other relevant parts of the outline discussed in Chapter III.

The focused evaluation team is principally concerned with the aspects specified for the focused evaluation (e.g., enrollment patterns, finances, building program, curriculum development, specific requests for institutional change). Therefore, the data needed by the team are circumscribed. The team's time on campus is limited, and it will need to direct its energies primarily toward gathering the data it needs for dealing with its areas of focus. Its fundamental purposes are to determine whether the institution has addressed the areas of concern and to assess the impact of significant changes related to them. However, if matters outside the focus of the visit come to the attention of the team it should note these, recommending changes in the Statement of Affiliation Status if necessary to deal with these additional areas.

Writing the Report

The team summarizes its findings concerning these matters in a written report. While every Team Report on a focused evaluation is different, each must contain four essential elements. Three of these elements are the same as those in a comprehensive report; one is different. Every focused report must:

- provide certain matters of information;
- assess the areas of focus;
- offer advice and suggestions related to the areas of focus to the institution;
- conclude with the team's formal recommendation and its rationale for that recommendation.

The first and third of these essential elements are identical to those discussed at length in Chapter IV of this *Manual;* the second essential element of a focused report differs from that of a comprehensive report because of the differences in purpose between comprehensive and focused evaluations; the fourth essential element is basically the same as that discussed in Chapter IV.

If the focused visit was **required by a previous evaluation,** the team's responsibility is to assess whether the institution has made progress in the areas and to report significant developments since the last Commission visit. If the focused evaluation was prompted by **a proposed change in the institution's Statement of Affiliation Status,** the team's responsibility is to evaluate whether the proposed change should be approved. (For further information on institutional change, see Chapter VI of *A Handbook of Accreditation.*) This section of its report should be detailed enough to allow readers to understand the most important changes the institution has undergone or is planning, and to evaluate how well the institution has responded to previous Commission concerns.

Like the report of a comprehensive evaluation, the report of a focused evaluation concludes with a fourth essential element: the team's recommendation. And, like the comprehensive team report, the focused report's recommendation has three parts: a standard recommendation sentence, a rationale, and a Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status.

The recommendation sentence for every focused evaluation is the same:

> **The team's recommendations for action concerning College X are shown on the attached Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status. The reasons for the team's recommendations are:**

The recommendation sentence is followed by a section in which the team states its **rationale** for each of its specific recommendations. The team does this by discussing its suggested version of each part of the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status. Since an institution's accreditation with the Commission can only be altered as a result of a comprehensive evaluation, the only recommendation the focused evaluation team may make concerning the Status section of the Worksheet is a recommendation of probation. It may recommend changes in any of the other sections of the SAS; in each case, it follows the guidelines discussed in Chapter IV.

Review Processes and Commission Action

Like the comprehensive evaluation, focused visits must pass through a review process before final action is taken by the Commission. Institutions undergoing focused visits may choose the process they prefer. The review processes of the Commission are discussed in Chapter IV of the *Handbook* and Chapter V of this *Manual*.

CHAPTER VII

SPECIAL CASES

Pre-Visits

Pre-visits are seldom necessary. However, if special features about an institution or its evaluation appear to require extensive pre-planning before the team visit, the chairperson and the Executive Officer may decide that a pre-visit is desirable. Such visits normally last only one day. The chairperson makes the final decision about conducting a pre-visit after consulting with the Commission staff. The institution is billed separately for the cost of the pre-visit by the Commission office. (See *Handbook*, Appendix A.)

A pre-visit is devoted to establishing the details of the evaluation plan. The team chair talks with administrators, faculty and students to get a clear impression of the institution, to examine its logistical or programmatic particularities, and to develop a sense of its atmosphere and style so that the team can later approach its evaluation with a minimum of lost time and a maximum of effectiveness.

The team chair reviews the institution's Self-Study Report as a part of the pre-visit to determine whether any additional information may be needed by the team. The chairperson also checks on practical arrangements for the visit and confirms appointments with members of the institution's state or local governing board(s).

As soon as the pre-visit is finished, the team chair mails an expense voucher for the trip to the Commission office for reimbursement. At the same time, the chairperson should contact the staff member coordinating the evaluation if the pre-visit has indicated that there may be significant omissions or imbalances in the team or if preparations for the evaluation appear to be at variance with the information the Commission has provided.

Sequential Visits

In most cases, visits to institutions with off-campus programs or sites follow the patterns described earlier in this *Manual*. Establishing the logistics of the visit may require a pre-visit by the team chair, and conducting the evaluation may involve team members separating for part of the visit to examine different sites—but the basic structure of the team visit remains the same.

In some cases, however, an institution may have so many sites, so widely dispersed within and outside of its home state, the North

Central region, and/or the United States that a sequential visit conducted over a longer period of time is required for a thorough evaluation of the institution and its operations. Sequential visits require that the Commission and the institution agree on an appropriate evaluation design and that team members be willing to commit themselves to a longer period of time away from their home campuses than is required for other types of visits. Team members who agree to serve on sequential visits receive additional information on the particulars of the visit from the Commission staff. Fees for sequential evaluations are billed on a cost-plus basis. (See *Handbook*, Appendix A.)

Interregional Visits

In an interregional team visit, the Commission visits a site outside the North Central region and includes on the team representatives from the institutional accrediting association in whose region the site is located. The Commission retains full responsibility for these visits, including composing the team, establishing the procedures for the visit, and taking final accrediting action. The Commission regards its Team Report as the only official report of the visit and sends a copy of it to the other regional association as well as to the institution. The institution is billed for all team members in accordance with the Commission's fee schedule. (See *Handbook*, Appendix A.)

Joint Visits

In a joint accrediting team visit, the Commission and another accrediting body together name a single team which prepares a single written report. The Commission and the other accrediting agency develop an agreement which outlines procedures and processes for the visit; the institution requesting a joint visit accepts the agreement. In some cases the team will be chaired and the final report written by an evaluator from the other association; in others, the Commission will appoint the chair. In either case, each accrediting body makes its accrediting decision separately. Commission policy restricts joint accrediting team visits with other COPA-recognized institutional accrediting bodies to those which accredit institutions primarily offering postbaccalaureate programs in a single discipline. The institution is billed separately for each organization's participation.

Generalist Visits

At the request of the institution, the Commission staff will assign a person to serve as a Generalist during the evaluation visit to the institution by a COPA-recognized specialized accrediting body. The role of the Generalist is to assist the team in approaching its task within the overall context of the institution. The institution is

billed for the Generalist's participation by the Commission. (See *Handbook*, Appendix A.)

Confirmation Visits

From time to time an institution asks that the Commission conduct a visit required by some other external agency. For example, some branches of the military, some state agencies, and some foreign countries require as a part of their formal approval processes a site visit by a regional accrediting agency. When a site visit is not required by the Commission itself, the Commission cooperates by sending a team which will write a confirmation report for the institution to submit to the proper authorities. Confirmation visits do not require official Commission action and, therefore, do not involve any processes beyond providing a report to the institution. The institution is billed for the confirmation visit by the Commission. (See *Handbook*, Appendix A.)

APPENDIX A

THE GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

The General Institutional Requirements and the Evaluative Criteria for Accreditation and Candidacy are reprinted here for convenient reference. They are discussed in detail in Chapter II of *A Handbook of Accreditation* and in Chapter III of *A Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation.*

GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

An institution affiliated with the Commission by either accreditation or candidacy has to meet the following Requirements:

Mission and authorization

1.a. The institution has formally adopted and made public its statement of mission.

1.b. The statement of mission is appropriate to an institution of higher education.

1.c. The institution confers certificates, diplomas or degrees.

1.d. The institution has legal authority to confer its certificates, diplomas and degrees.

1.e. The institution meets all legal requirements to operate wherever it conducts activities.

2.a. The educational programs are compatible with the institution's mission.

2.b. The principal educational programs are based on recognized fields of study at the postsecondary level.

2.c. At least one of the undergraduate programs is two or more academic years in length (or the equivalent). If no undergraduate programs are offered, at least one of the graduate programs is one or more academic years in length (or the equivalent).

2.d. General education at the postsecondary level is an essential element of undergraduate degree programs and a prerequisite to graduate degree programs.

2.e. General education and/or a program of related instruction at the postsecondary level is an essential element of undergraduate certificate and diploma programs two or more academic years in length.

2.f. The certificate, diploma or degree awarded upon successful completion of an educational program is appropriate to the demonstrated attainment of the graduate.

Institutional organization

3.a. There is a governing board, legally responsible for the institution, which establishes and regularly reviews basic policies that govern the institution and protect its integrity.

3.b. The governing board includes individuals who represent the public interest. (Note: In rare situations the Commission may approve alternative means by which the interests of the public are appropriately represented when unusual circumstances prohibit public representatives on the board.)

3.c. An executive officer is designated by the governing board to administer the institution.

3.d. A faculty comprising persons qualified by education and experience is significantly involved in the development and review of the educational programs.

3.e. Admissions policies are consistent with the institution's mission and appropriate to the educational programs.

3.f. Admissions practices conform to the admissions policies.

Financial resources

4.a. The institution has financial resources sufficient to support its activities.

4.b. The institution has its financial statements externally audited on a regular schedule by a certified public accountant or state audit agency.

Public disclosure

5.a. The institution publishes in its catalog or other appropriate places accurate information that fairly describes

i. its educational programs,
ii. its policies and procedures directly affecting students,
iii. its charges and its refund policies,
iv. the academic credentials of its faculty members and administrators.

5.b. The institution makes available upon request accurate information that fairly describes its financial resources.

THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

An accredited institution fulfills four **Evaluative Criteria:**

1. it has clear and publicly stated purposes, consistent with its mission and appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution;

2. it has effectively organized adequate human, financial and physical resources into educational and other programs to accomplish its purposes;

3. it is accomplishing its purposes;

4. it can continue to accomplish its purposes.

THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR CANDIDACY FOR ACCREDITATION

A candidate for accreditation fulfills four **Evaluative Criteria:**

1. it has clear and publicly stated purposes, consistent with its mission and appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution;

2. it has effectively organized adequate human, financial and physical resources into educational and other programs so that it is accomplishing its immediate purposes;

3. it is following realistic plans to acquire and organize any additional resources needed to accomplish its stated purposes;

4. it has the potential to achieve accreditation within the candidacy period.

APPENDIX B

A SAMPLE TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Before the Visit

23-29 months before	• Commission notifies institution of scheduled evaluation • Institution initiates planning for self-study process
21-27 months before	• Institution notifies Commission of its self-study coordinator, its preferred dates for the visit, and any proposed changes in its Statement of Affiliation Status • Institution appoints Self-Study Steering Committee
18-24 months before	• Institution sends representatives to the Self-Study Institute
20 months before	• Steering Committee develops a self-study plan and submits it to Commission staff for review • Steering Committee organizes and selects principal sub-committees • Sub-committees gather data, interview, analyze, and develop draft reports for submission to the Steering Committee
12-17 months before	• Commission sends one-year reminder letter to institution
11-16 months before	• Institution sends Commission information on team competencies
10 months before	• Steering Committee analyzes information received, completes studies, prepares rough draft of Self-Study Report
6-12 months before	• Commission sends a list of proposed team members and an Evaluation Visit Summary Sheet to institution
4-10 months before	• Commission notifies institution and team that team is complete • Steering Committee circulates and receives reactions to draft report
6 months before	• Editor compiles final Self-Study Report • Team chair contacts institution to make arrangements for evaluation visit

3 months before	• Institution completes duplication of Self-Study Report, completes BIDs, etc.
2 months before	• Institution sends one complete set of evaluation materials to the Commission
1 month before	• Institution sends one complete set of evaluation materials to each member of the evaluation team • Commission sends to team and institution materials for the visit including the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status
0	• The visit takes place

After the Visit

1 month after	• Team chair completes draft of Team Report and circulates it for corrections of errors of fact
1 1/2 months after	• Team chair completes final Team Report and submits it to the Commission
2 months after	• Commission duplicates Team Report and sends copies to the institution and the team • Institution sends response to Team Report to Commission and team and (if it has a choice) chooses the review process it prefers
2-5 months after	• Review Process—**Readers' Panel** — Commission sends names of readers to institution and sends Team Report to each Reader — Institution sends Self-Study Report, BIDs, institutional catalogs, faculty and student handbooks, and response to Team Report to each Reader • Review Process—**Review Committee** — Commission sends Review Committee schedule and names of Committee members to institution and team chair and sends Team Report to Review Committee members — Institution sends each Review Committee member Self-Study Report, BIDs, institutional response, and any other information it believes is relevant — Institutional and team representatives meet with the Review Committee
3-8 months after	• Commission action

APPENDIX C

INSTITUTIONAL MATERIALS FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Materials to be sent **by the institution** to the Commission staff **at least two months before** the evaluation visit **(one set)**:
   - the appropriate report (Self-Study Report, Focused Report)
   - completed Basic Institutional Data Forms*
   - latest institutional catalog(s)
   - faculty and student handbooks

2. Materials to be sent **by the institution** directly to each member of the evaluation team **one month before** the on-site visit **(one set to each team member)**:
   - the appropriate report (Self-Study Report, Focused Report)
   - completed Basic Institutional Data Forms*
   - latest institutional catalog(s)
   - faculty and student handbooks

3. Materials to be set aside in an office on campus for use by the evaluation team:
   - charter and/or formal authority from an appropriate government agency in each jurisdiction in which the institution operates authorizing it to award a certificate, diploma or degree at the level at which accreditation (or candidacy) is sought
   - information about the institution's governing board, including a roster of members, minutes of Board meetings, etc.
   - bylaws or statutes of the institution
   - budget for current year
   - major institutional reports and records, such as minutes of faculty meetings, the chief executive officer's annual reports, etc.
   - reports submitted to, and evaluation team reports received from, professional accrediting agencies in the last five years
   - summary data regarding faculty teaching loads
   - summary data regarding the number and size-range of classes
   - collective bargaining agreement

4. **Materials to be sent by the institution to each member of the Readers' Panel or Review Committee which will consider its evaluation. (Three sets for the Readers' Panel; up to twelve sets for the Review Committee.)**

   - the appropriate report (Self-Study Report, Focused Report)
   - completed Basic Institutional Data Forms*
   - latest institutional catalog(s)
   - faculty and student handbooks
   - institutional response to the Team Report

   The Commission will send the names and addresses of the reviewers to the institution after the final Team Report and institutional response have been received. The Commission forwards copies of the Team Report.

* The full set of BIDs is not required for a focused visit unless it is pertinent to the visit's scope.

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE EVALUATION VISIT SUMMARY SHEET

1234
8/15/87

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
159 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60601

EVALUATION VISIT SUMMARY SHEET

INSTITUTION: John Dewey College
1100 South State Street
Chicago, IL 60605

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Dr. Jane E. Jones, President
(312) 942-6060 Ext. 25

SELF-STUDY COORDINATOR: Dr. Steven J. Doe, Academic Dean (Ext. 20)

ENROLLMENT: 600 (FTE)

TYPE OF EVALUATION: A comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation at the Master's (professional) degree-granting level

DATE OF VISIT: November 7-9, 1988

LENGTH OF VISIT: 3 days

DRAFT REPORT DUE: December 7, 1988

NCA STAFF: Dr. Charles Hall
(800) 621-7440
(312) 263-0456

FINAL REPORT DUE: December 21, 1988

COMMISSION ACTION: March 2-3, 1989

EVALUATION FEE: $5150.00

EVALUATION FEE (Chair listed first):

Dr. Emma Willard
Dean, College of Education
Hutchins University
Aspen, CO 80303
(303) 499-7111
Higher Ed Administration/Teacher Education/Off-Campus Programs

Dr. Willard Gibbs
Professor of Physics
Oppenheimer University
Los Alamos, NM 87105
(505) 666-1212
Physics/Computer Science

Dr. Elizabeth Peabody
President
Curti College
Madison, WI 53703
(608) 521-6371
Administration/Finance/Planning

Dr. Charles S. Pierce
Chair, Humanities Division
Fitzgerald College
St. Paul, MN 55422
(612) 323-4141
Administration/English/Curriculum Development

APPENDIX E

A PLANNING CHECKLIST FOR THE TEAM CHAIRPERSON

Contact the executive officer to request that the institution

- make hotel reservations
- reserve a team meeting room at the hotel, if possible
- provide a meeting room for the team on campus
- set aside in the team's meeting room on campus the materials specified in Appendix C of this *Manual*
- provide secretarial assistance, if possible
- arrange for early meetings during the visit with
  - — members of the governing board
  - — representatives of the state coordinating board or other related agency
  - — faculty representatives
  - — student representatives
  - — alumni and community leaders
- announce the visit and the availability of the team to confer with institutional personnel during "open time"
- make certain that all key personnel are available during the visit
- mail all institutional materials to the team one month before the visit

Contact team members to

- welcome any new C-Es and offer to provide additional assistance
- notify team members of hotel and other arrangements
- schedule the first team meeting
- share preliminary evaluation plan
- make tentative assignments of areas of special responsibility, including report writing
- request that they review the *Handbook of Accreditation, Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation,* and *Manual for the Evaluation Visit,* and that they bring these documents with them to the institution

The team chair should send copies of all correspondence to the Commission staff member working with the institution.

APPENDIX F

A SAMPLE TITLE PAGE

REPORT OF A VISIT

TO

JOHN DEWEY COLLEGE

Chicago, Illinois

November 7-9, 1988

for the

Commission of Institutions of Higher Education

of the

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

EVALUATION TEAM

Charles S. Pierce, Chairperson of the Humanities Division, Fitzgerald College, St. Paul MN 55422

Willard Gibbs, Professor of Physics, Oppenheimer University, Los Alamos NM 87105

Elizabeth Peabody, President, Curti College, Madison WI 53703

Emma Willard, Dean of the College of Education, Hutchins University, Aspen CO 80303 (Chairperson)

APPENDIX G

A SAMPLE SAS WORKSHEET

(For an institution not required to appear before a Review Committee)

WORKSHEET FOR STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS

INSTITUTION:	JOHN DEWEY COLLEGE 1100 South State Street Chicago, IL 60605
TYPE OF REVIEW:	A comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation at the Master's (professional) degree-granting level.
DATE OF THIS REVIEW:	November 7-9, 1988
DATE OF SAS:	February 1, 1984
REFERRED BY:	
COMMISSION ACTION:	

CONTROL:	John Dewey College is a private, not-for-profit institution.
Institution	Recommended Wording: NO CHANGE
Team	Recommended Wording: NO CHANGE

STATUS:	John Dewey College is accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Accredited: 1952–
Institution	Recommended Wording: NO CHANGE
Team	Recommended Wording: NO CHANGE

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS:	The College offers programs leading to the Bachelor's (arts and sciences and professional curricula) degrees and Master's (professional curricula) degrees.
Institution	Recommended Wording: NO CHANGE
Team	Recommended Wording: NO CHANGE

LOCATIONS:	The College offers courses and programs at its campus in Chicago, Illinois; some courses and some programs are also offered at Moline and Galena, Illinois, and at various locations within Illinois.
Institution	Recommended Wording: The College offers courses and programs at its campus in Chicago, Illinois; some courses and some programs are also offered at Moline, Galena, and Dixon, Illinois, and at various locations within Illinois.
Team	Recommended Wording: The College offers courses and programs at its campus in Chicago, Illinois; some courses and some programs are also offered at Moline, Galena, and Dixon, Illinois, and at various locations within Illinois.
STIPULATIONS:	None.
Institution	Recommended Wording: NO CHANGE
Team	Recommended Wording: The College's programs at the master's degree-granting level are limited to the Master in Business Administration degree program.
REPORTS REQUIRED:	None.
Team	Recommended Wording: NO CHANGE
FOCUSED EVALUATIONS:	None.
Team	Recommended Wording: The College is scheduled for an evaluation in 1993-94 focused on the success of the College in improving its financial condition and its development at the graduate level.
COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATIONS:	John Dewey College's most recent comprehensive evaluation occurred in 1983-84. Its next comprehensive evaluation is scheduled for 1988-89.
Team	Recommended Wording: John Dewey College's most recent comprehensive evaluation occurred in 1988-89. Its next comprehensive evaluation is scheduled for 1998-99.

INDEX OF COMMISSION POLICIES

The following is an index of Commission policies with references to where information related to each policy can be found in *A Handbook of Accreditation*, *A Guide to Self-Study for Commission Evaluation*, and *A Manual for the Evaluation Visit*. The index appears in all three publications and is designed as a cross-reference. H/ identifies the *Handbook*, M/ the *Manual*, and G/ the *Guide* followed by the appropriate page number(s). The number ( ) following each policy identifies its internal policy number.

I. EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND THE COMMISSION

A. *Policies on Institutional Affiliation*

Types of Affiliation (I.A.1) — H/10

- Candidacy (I.A.1a.) — H/10-11, 19-21
- Accreditation (I.A.1b.) — H/10-11, 16-19
- General Institutional Requirements (I.A.1c.) — H/11-16

Withdrawal of Application for Accredited or Candidate Status (I.A.2.) — H/32

Resignation from Affiliation with the Commission (I.A.3.) — H/11

Institutional Obligations of Affiliation (I.A.4.) — H/21

Good Practices of Institutional Conduct (I.A.5.) — H/64-73, M/13

B. *Policies on Accreditation Process*

Commission Right to Reconsider Affiliation (I.B.1.) — H/28

Mechanics of the Process

- Statement of Affiliation Status (I.B.2a.) — H/22-26
- Communication with Institution (I.B.2b.) — H/15
- Exit Interview (I.B.2c.) — M/18-19
- Distribution of the Team Report (I.B.2d.) — M/33
- Public Disclosure of the Team Report (I.B.2e.) — H/44
- Institutional Response to Team Report (I.B.2f.) — H/31, M/34
- Review of Team Recommendation
  - — Readers' Panel (I.B.2g(1). — H/31, M/34-35
  - — Review Committee (I.B.2g(2).) — H/31, M/35-37
- Response to Review Committee Recommendation (I.B.2h.) — H/31, M/36-37
- Other Recommendations to the Commission
  - — Evaluators' Panel (I.B.2i(1).) — H/38
  - — Commission Staff Recommendations (I.B.2i(2).) — H/33, 37-39

- Institutional Use of Review Processes (I.B.2j.) H/31, M/34
- Commission Action (I.B.2k.) H/32

Sanctions of the Process

- Memorandum for the Record (I.B.3a.) H/40
- Probation (I.B.3b.) H/40-41
- Commission Withdrawal of Affiliation (I.B.3c.) H/41

Institutional Response to Sanctions

- Reapplication of Institution Denied Candidacy (I.B.4a.) H/21
- Reapplication of Institution Denied Accredited Status (I.B.4b.) H/21
- Reapplication after Commission Withdrawal of Candidacy or Accreditation (I.B.4c.) H/41
- Grounds for Appeals (I.B.4d.) H/41-42
  — Institutional Change during Appeal Period (I.B.4d(1).) H/37

C. Policies Regarding Institutional Dynamics

Changes Affecting the Statement of Affiliation Status (I.C.1.) H/35-36

- Commission Delegation of Authority (I.C.1a.) H/33, 37-39

Limited Course Offerings Outside Degree Programs (I.C.2.) H/39

Transfer and Award of Academic Credit (I.C.3.) OR*

Separately Accreditable Institutions (I.C.4.) H/39

Transfer of Accreditation (I.C.5.) H/39

II. THE COMMISSION AND CONSULTANT-EVALUATORS

A. Policies on Consultant-Evaluators

Eligibility and Selection of Consultant-Evaluators (II.A.1.) M/2

Length of Appointment (II.A.2.) OR*

Availability of Consultant-Evaluator Data Forms to Others (II.A.3.) OR*

B. Policies on Visiting Teams

Size of Team (II.B.1.) H/47

Institution Review of Team (II.B.2.) H/29, M/2

Conflict of Interest (II.B.3.) M/2-3

Executive Commissioners Participation on Teams (II.B.4.) OR*

Observers on Teams (II.B.5.) M/3

C. Policies on Consultant Services

Recommendation of Consultants (II.C.1.) OR*

C-Es Serving as Institutional Consultants (II.C.2.) M/3

Generalist Service (II.C.3.) M/43-44

III. THE COMMISSION AND OTHER AGENCIES

A. Policies Concerning Other Accrediting Agencies

Professional Accreditation (III.A.1.) H/2

Relationships Between the Commission and Other Institutional or Specialized Accrediting Agencies (III.A.2.) M/43

B. Policies Concerning Governmental Agencies

Relations with U.S. Government (III.B.1.) H/8

Relations with States, Coordinating Boards, and Higher Boards (III.B.2.) H/8-9

C. Policies Concerning Specialized Non-Accrediting Agencies

Unions (III.C.1.) M/13

Intercollegiate Athletics (III.C.2.) OR*

Endorsement of Policies of Other Agencies (III.C.3.) OR*

IV. THE COMMISSION AND THE PUBLIC

A. Policies on Public Disclosure

Public Meetings of the Commission (IV.A.1.) OR*

Publication of Accredited Status by the Commission (IV.A.2.) H/44

Public Disclosure of Team Report (IV.A.3.) H/44

Publication of Reasons for Probation (IV.A.4.) H/40-41

Public Disclosure of the Statement of Affiliation Status (IV.A.5.) H/44-45

Commission Disclosure of an Institution's Affiliation Status (IV.A.6.) H/44-45

B. Policies on Complaints Against Affiliated Institutions

Complaints Against Affiliated Institutions (IV.B.1.) H/45-46

V. THE COMMISSION AND ITS STAFF

A. Policies on Staff Relation with Commission

Staff Relation with Commission (V.A.1.) H/6,29; M/10

B. Policies on Staff Relation to Institution

Staff Relation to Institution (V.B.1.) H/29

OR* Indicates an internal policy not mentioned in the publications. The policy is available from the Commission office on request.

THE COMMISSION 1988

Chairperson: Sister M. Janet McGilley (1988), President, St. Mary College, Leavenworth KS

Vice Chairperson: Dr. Lewis S. Salter (1988), President, Wabash College, Crawfordsville IN

Ms. Yolanda Guaderrama Alexander (1989) *(public member)* President, Guaderrama Farms, Las Cruces NM

Ms. Margaret S. Anderson (1991) *(public member)* Tucson AZ

Dr. George E. Ayers (1990), President, Chicago State University IL

Dr. Jack L. Bottenfield (1991), President, Three Rivers Community College, Poplar Bluff MO

Dr. Jane Cauvel (1989), Professor of Philosophy, Colorado College, Colorado Springs CO

Dr. George C. Christensen (1988), Executive Director of International Affairs and Clarence H. Couvalt Distinguished Professor of Veterinary Medicine, Iowa State University, Ames IA

Dr. Frederick J. Crosson (1989), Cavanaugh Distinguished Professor of Humanities, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame IN

Dr. Roland Dille (1989), President, Moorhead State University, Moorhead MN

Ms. Sue Seibert Farnsworth (1988) *(public member)* Attorney, Wheeling WV

Dr. Charles A. Green (1989), President, Rio Salado Community College, Phoenix AZ

Dr. Rita S. Meyer (1991), Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Minnesota Technical College-Crookston, Crookston MN

Dr. Joan Wadlow (1990), Provost, University of Oklahoma-Norman, Norman OK

Dr. Morton W. Weir (1990), Acting Chancellor, University of Illinois, Urbana IL

THE COMMISSION STAFF 1988

Dr. Patricia A. Thrash, Director
Dr. Joseph J. Semrow, Associate Director
Dr. Steven D. Crow, Assistant Director
Dr. Jean Mather, Assistant Director
Ms. Susan E. Van Kollenburg, Assistant Director/Operations

A MANUAL FOR THE EVALUATION VISIT

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
159 North Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
1988-89